



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,781	11/18/2003	Zyad Ahmad Dwekat	024777.0126PTUS	4548
IP Department Patton Boggs, LLP Suite 3000 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201				
7590 10/17/2008				
EXAMINER				
AL AUBAIDI, RASHIA S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,781

Applicant(s)

DWEKAT ET AL.

Examiner

RASHA S. AL AUBAIDI

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This in response to amendment filed 07/01/2008. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been amended. Claims 1-34 are still pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-34 are ejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US PAT # 6,285,748).

Regarding claim 1, Lewis teaches a method for managing telecommunication trunk groups (reads on the network traffic controller system, see abstract), the method comprising: receiving information regarding the configuration of telephony circuits comprising each trunk group to be managed (see col. 1, lines 35-38); receiving traffic information regarding the historical volume of traffic (see col. 1, lines 39-52) using the hardware associated with trunk groups (see col. 3, lines 11-18).

Lewis teaches the terminals 102, 104 and 106, have a display unit as shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

However, Lewis does not specifically teach "displaying information regarding at least one trunk group...etc" as recited in claim 1.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have these kind of information presented on display in order to make these information visible and easy to track. The use of display is old and well known in the art.

Claims 7, 13, 19, 29 and 34 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. The claimed feature of "determining the percentage utilization of each trunk group...etc" as recited in claims 13 and 29 is obvious if not inherent and it is reflected on the table 1 (see col. 4).

Claims 2-4, 14-15 20-23 and 30-31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 13, 19 and 29. Lewis teaches that the monitoring and controlling the traffic is done automatically. Lewis does not teach that a user may select and control the displayed trunk group as recited in claims 12, 14, 20 and 30. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to controlling trunk group either manually or automatically. The feature of automatic verses manual is obvious and well known in the art and it does not raise to the level of patentability. *In re Venner*, 262 F. 2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); the court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient over prior art.

The limitations of claims 5-6, 16-18 and 32-33 of "removal" and "addition" of trunk are obvious and well known in the art because obviously an ordinary skill in the art may select and choose to add more trunks or remove trunks based on the need and desire.

Regarding claims 8-10 and 24-26, see col. 3, lines 56-67 and col. 4, lines 1-43.

Regarding claims 11 and 27 limitations, see col. 1, lines 8-22, col. 2, lines 1-14 and col. 4, lines 53-67.

For claims 12 and 28, see Fig. 3.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 07/01/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues "With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Lewis teaches a method for managing telecommunications trunk groups. However, Lewis nowhere mentions trunk group". The Examiner respectfully because a trunk as defined in the Newton's Telecom Dictionary is the communication line between two switching system. The Lewis reference is directed to managing and controlling communication lines network traffic between terminals that are utilized by users. Thus Lewis obviously directed to managing trunks between or among users within the network, Even though Lewis does not specifically disclose the term "trunk group".

Also, regarding Applicant's argument for claims 7, 13, 19, 29 and 34, the Examiner believes that the feature of "determining the percentage utilization" feature as recites in claim 13 for example, is inherent if not obvious in the Lewis system and the claimed table is a reflection of this determination and usage. The feature of determining the percentage is a must in the Lewis system in order to manage the traffic.

Also, for Applicant's arguments regarding claims 2-4, 14-15, 20-23 and 30-31, the Examiner did not ignore the rejection of these claims as applicant alleged. As a matter of fact, the Examiner rejected some claims that have similar limitations such as "display" and "calculating the number" as recited in claim 3, which the examiner believes it is an obvious limitation and it is similar to these limitation that are related to the use and "determining the percentage" cited in claim 13.

The Examiner believes that all other limitations are already addressed in the above rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Rasha S AL-Aubaidi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614